

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are present in the above-captioned application and have been subjected to restriction under 35 U.S.C. §121 as follows:

Species A:	Figures	1-2A
Species B:	Figure	2B
Species C:	Figure	2C
Species D:	Figure	2D
Species E:	Figure	2E
Species F:	Figure	2F
Species G:	Figure	3A-3B
Species H:	Figures	3C
Species I:	Figures	3D
Species J:	Figures	?

Applicants provisionally elect Species A, which reads upon Claims 1-22, 24, 25 and 28-31. Claim 1 is generic.

The restriction requirement is traversed. The fact that the Patent Office classifies the above-listed species in different parts of its classification system does not show that these three groups of claims have acquired a separate status in the art. The

classification system developed by the Patent Office has over 100,000 different categories and is intended to help Examiners and other individuals find references relatively quickly; not to show whether particular subjects are considered to be separate by those in the art. The classification system of the Patent Office is constantly being changed, clearly showing that it is not a good basis for making a permanent decision about whether three groups of claims should be divided among two separate patent applications.

Hence, it is respectfully urged that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the requirement for restriction and provide an action on the merits with respect to all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Paolino/
John M. Paolino, Reg. No. 40,340
Attorney for Applicant

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2518